

Practitioner's Docket No. MI22-1171

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Akram et al., Salman

Application No.: 09/292,132

Filed: 04/14/99

For: Methods of Forming a Transistor Gate

Group No.: 2812

Examiner: S. Mulpuri

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 17 2004

OFFICIAL

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below:

Examiner's Interview Summary of February 13, 2004

2/17/04
Date

Robin Saldivia


Signature3 pages total

(Certification of Facsimile Transmission--page 1 of 1)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No. 09/292,132
Filing Date April 14, 1999
Inventor Salman Akram et al.
Assignee Micron Technology, Inc.
Group Art Unit 2812
Examiner Savitri Mulpuri
Attorney's Docket No. MI22-1171
Title: Methods of Forming a Transistor Gate

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 13, 2004

FEB 17 2004

To: Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313

From: D. Brent Kenady
Tel. 509-624-4276; Fax 509-838-3424
Wells St. John P.S.
601 West First Avenue, Suite 1300
Spokane, WA 99201-3828

OFFICIAL

Applicant's representative held an interview with Examiner Mulpuri on February 13, 2004. Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Mulpuri for her time and attention to this matter.

The pending claims of the above referenced application stand subject to a restriction requirement presented in paper no. 103103 between alleged patentably distinct species of inventions wherein the Examiner provides two listings of claims and describes what the Examiner believes is the alleged subject matter of each claim set. Applicant responded to the restriction requirement on


December 8, 2003 and respectfully pointed out that the subject matter of each claim set is not consistent with the Examiner's characterization of each claim set.

Accordingly, when Examiner Mulpuri called Applicant's representative to discuss the above-referenced case to discuss possible allowance for a set of claims, Applicant's representative respectfully stated that the discussion of allowance can only commence after the issues regarding the improper grouping of claims for restriction is finally resolved. Accordingly, no agreement was reached.

Applicant thanks Examiner Mulpuri for time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-17-04

By: 
D. Brent Kenady
Reg. No. 40,045